



APR

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Atty Docket Number: A01484

In re application of :

Koller et al

: Confirmation No.: 4478

Serial No: 10/762,047

: Group Art Unit: 1773

Filed: January 21, 2004

: Examiner: Leszek B. Kiliman

For: Organic-Inorganic Composite Particle And Process For Preparation Thereof

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Sir:

I hereby certify that the following correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated next to my signature below:

Appellant's Brief (Original + 1 copy)

Fee Transmittal (in duplicate)

Return Receipt Postcard

July 27, 2006
Date

Shelly Dany
Signature



GROUP ART UNIT: 1773

APPEAL NO. _____

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

APPEAL BRIEF

In re the Application of KOLLER et al.

Filed: January 21, 2004

Serial No. 10/762,047

For: ORGANIC-INORGANIC COMPOSITE PARTICLE AND PROCESS FOR
PREPARATION THEREOF

Kim R. Jessum
Attorney for Appellants

Leszek B. Kiliman
Examiner

Enclosed:
Original + 1 Copy
Filing Fee via Deposit Account Form (in duplicate)
Certificate of Mailing

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : KOLLER et al.

Application No. : 10/762,047 **Group No. :** 1773

Filed : January 21, 2004 **Examiner :** Leszek B. Kiliman

For: ORGANIC-INORGANIC COMPOSITE PARTICLE AND
PROCESS FOR PREPARATION THEREOF

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

This is an appeal from the rejection dated February 24, 2006 finally rejecting claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-10. The rejected claims are set out in the Appendix. Appellants filed a Notice of Appeal pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.191 on May 24, 2006.

Real Party In Interest

The owner of the present application and the invention contained therein is
ROHM AND HAAS COMPANY.

Related Appeals and Interferences

No appeals or interferences are known to Appellants, the Appellants' legal representative, or the assignee which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

Status Of Claims

The status of the claims is as follows:

Claims pending: 1-2, 4-7 and 9-10

Allowed claims: none

Claims objected to: none

Claims rejected: 1-2, 4-7 and 9-10

Claims on appeal: 1-2, 4-7 and 9-10

Claims withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner: none

Status of Amendments after Final Rejection

No amendments were filed after final rejection of the present application.

Summary Of Claimed Subject Matter

The present invention provides an aqueous dispersion comprising organic-inorganic composite particles [p. 3, lines 24-29], each organic-inorganic composite particle comprising:

- a) a primary composite particle [p. 5, lines 13-14] comprising:
 - i) an inorganic particle [p. 5, lines 14-16] , and
 - ii) a plurality of polymer particles covalently bonded to said inorganic particle [p. 5, lines 14-16; p. 14, lines 25-26]; and
- b) a polymer layer encapsulating said primary composite particle [p. 3, lines 22-23].

The present invention also provides a process for preparing an aqueous dispersion, having organic-inorganic composite particles, comprising the steps of:

- a) providing primary composite particles dispersed in an aqueous medium, wherein each of said primary composite particles comprise: an inorganic particle and a plurality of polymer particles covalently bonded to said inorganic particle [p. 3, lines 25-27; p. 14, lines 25-26]; and
- b) polymerizing at least one monomer in the presence of said primary composite particles to form a polymer layer encapsulating said primary composite particles and to provide said organic-inorganic composite particles [p.3, lines 29-31].

Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bardman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,710,161).

Argument

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 1-2 and 6-7

Appellants respectfully submit that the present invention is not obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because A) the §103(a) rejection is improper; and B) Bardman et al. do not teach a process for making an aqueous dispersion and the aqueous dispersion comprising organic-inorganic composite particles, each having all of the limitations: a) a primary composite particle comprising i) an inorganic particle, and ii) a plurality of polymer particles covalently bonded to said inorganic particle; and b) a polymer layer encapsulating said primary composite particle.

A. The §103(a) rejection is improper

The initial burden is on the examiner to provide some suggestion of the desirability of doing what the inventor has done. MPEP 706.02(j). "To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references." *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

In the Office Action of April 19, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 6-8 under 35. U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bardman et al. and 4-5 and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bardman et al. See, p. 2, 2nd paragraph; p. 3, 4th paragraph. In the Office Action of October 7, 2005, the Examiner withdrew the §102(e) rejection of claims 1-3 and 6-8 and rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bardman et al. See, p. 2, 4th paragraph. No explanation as to why the §102(e) rejection was withdrawn was included in the Office Action. In the Office Action of October 7, 2005 and the subsequent Office Action of February 24, 2006,

under the rejection under the 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner merely stated that Bardman et al. disclose “all elements of the claimed invention.” See, Office Action of 10/7/05, p. 3, 1st paragraph; Office Action of 2/24/06, p. 3, 1st paragraph. If this were the case, then the §102(e) rejection could not have been overcome. Thus, the rejection of claims 1-2 under §103(a) is improper and the claims are allowable.

B. Bardman et al. do not teach all of the limitations of claims 1-2 and 6-7

Even if claims 1-2 and 6-7 were rejected under §102(e), Bardman et al. do not disclose all of the limitations of the invention. It is well settled that all features of the instant claims must be taught or suggested somewhere in the art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974). In addition, all features of the instant claims must be found in the art itself, and cannot be harvested from the instant invention disclosure through impermissible hindsight reconstruction of the instant invention. See MPEP 2145.X.A. Accordingly, it is well settled that all features of the instant claims must have been taught in the art as of the time of the filing of the instant application and not thereafter. See MPEP 2141.01.III.

First, Bardman et al. do not disclose composite particles having polymer particles covalently bonded (both adsorbed and reacted) to an inorganic particle, as claimed. Bardman et al. teach composite particles with polymer particles that are only “adsorbed to the surface of each pigment particle.” See, col. 13, lines 16-18; col. 14, lines 48-50. In the Office Action mailed on February 24, 2006, the Examiner does not even address this limitation and cites the same information in Bardman et al. as he did in the Office Action mailed on October 7, 2005, despite Applicants’ amendments of December 7, 2005 (and resent on January 4, 2006) specifying that the polymer particles are “covalently bonded.”

Second, Bardman et al. do not disclose encapsulating the composite particle, which comprises both the inorganic particle and the polymer particles covalently bonded thereto. In Bardman et al., a second polymer may be used as a film-forming binder. See, col. 15, lines 1-15. With a film-forming binder, the second polymer could, in essence, encapsulate the particles in layer of film (coating), but, according to the disclosure of Bardman et al., the second polymer would not encapsulate the particles while they are in an aqueous dispersion. The composite particle of Bardman et al., itself, does not contain

a primary composite particle having polymer particles covalently bonded to an inorganic particle, encapsulated by a polymer layer. See, Application, p. 5, second full paragraph.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 4-5 and 9-10

Appellants respectfully submit that the present invention is not obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because A) there claims depend upon claims 1 and 6, which are allowable, as discussed above, and B) Bardman et al. do not teach an aqueous dispersion and a process for preparing an aqueous dispersion having all of the limitations of claims 4-5 and 9-10.

A. Claims 4-5 and 9-10 depend upon claims 1 and 6

Claims 4-5 and 9-10 should be allowable as dependent upon allowable claims.

B. Bardman et al. do not teach the limitations of claims 4-5 and 9-10

In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Schenck v. Nortron Corp.*, 713 F.2d 782, 218 USPQ 698 (Fed. Cir. 1983). "The test for an implicit showing [of obviousness] is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

In addition, a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires that one skilled in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in light of the prior art. *In re Dow Chemical*, 837 F.2d 469, 473 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Presence of a property not possessed by the prior art is evidence of nonobviousness. *In re Papesch*, 315 F.2d 381, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963).

In the Office Action mailed on February 24, 2006, the Examiner stated that Bardman et al. do "not specifically teach the limitations of claims 4, 5, 9, 10" and do not disclose "that composite particle[s] may comprise encapsulated particles in aqueous dispersion[s]." Office Action of 2/24/06, p. 3, 1st full paragraph. The Examiner further

stated that “it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use the teaching of Bardman [et al.] ... and suspend such particles in aqueous dispersion, and vary the weight ratio of polymer particles and combine polymer weight, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.” Office Action of 2/24/06, p. 3, 2nd full paragraph.

The invention provides a dispersion and process for making the dispersion of organic-inorganic particles that, as a coating, have improved hiding, whiteness and gloss. See, Application, p. 1, lines 6-7. “These organic-inorganic composite particles allow the preparation of dried coatings containing lower levels of pigment, such as titanium dioxide; or are applied at lower coating weights than coatings not containing encapsulated titanium dioxide.” P. 3, lines 13-16. The polymer composition of Bardman et al. provides corrosion resistant coatings with improved solvent resistance (see, col. 1, lines 19-22, 35-36, 40-41), but does not possess the properties of improved whiteness or gloss.

The particles of Bardman et al. provide coatings with increased levels of hiding, but only when “compared to coating[s] containing equivalent levels of pigment particles but do not contain composite particles.” Col. 13, lines 21-24. Because Bardman et al. does not possess any of the improved properties of the invention, there would be no motivation to combine Bardman et al., which is directed to corrosion resistance and improved solvent resistance, with any knowledge possessed by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made with respect to suspending the particles and varying weights. Accordingly, the combination of the prior art reference and knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art cannot meet every single feature of the instant claims and thus does not constitute a *prima facie* case of obviousness. MPEP 2143.03.

III. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the pending claims are currently in condition for allowance. As such, Appellants respectfully request the Board to pass the pending claims to allowance.


10/762,047
July 24, 2006

A01484

Enclosed herewith, Appellants have filed a Certificate of Mailing to establish the timely filing of the instant Appeal Brief.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee which may be required, or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account 18-1850.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kim R. Jessum". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Kim R. Jessum
Attorney for Appellants
Registration No. 43,694

ROHM AND HAAS COMPANY
100 Independence Mall West
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2399
Telephone : (215) 592-3689

July 24, 2006

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. An aqueous dispersion comprising organic-inorganic composite particles, each organic-inorganic composite particle comprising:
 - a) a primary composite particle comprising:
 - i) an inorganic particle, and
 - ii) a plurality of polymer particles covalently bonded to said inorganic particle; and
 - b) a polymer layer encapsulating said primary composite particle.
2. The aqueous dispersion according to claim 1 wherein said polymer particles have absorbing groups selected from phosphorus acid groups, phosphorus acid full-ester groups, polyacid sidechain groups, and mixtures thereof.
4. The aqueous dispersion according to claim 1 wherein the weight ratio of said polymer particles that are attached to said inorganic particle to said polymer layer is in the range of from 10:1 to 1:10.
5. The aqueous dispersion according to claim 1 having a combined polymer weight of said polymer particles and said polymer layer in the range of from 5 to 90 weight %, based on the weight of said organic-inorganic composite particle.
6. A process for preparing an aqueous dispersion, having organic-inorganic composite particles, comprising the steps of:
 - a) providing primary composite particles dispersed in an aqueous medium, wherein each of said primary composite particles comprise: an inorganic particle and a plurality of polymer particles covalently bonded to said inorganic particle; and
 - b) polymerizing at least one monomer in the presence of said primary composite particles to form a polymer layer encapsulating said primary composite particles and to provide said organic-inorganic composite particles.
7. The process according to claim 6 wherein said polymer particles have at least one functional group selected from the group consisting of phosphorus acid groups, phosphorus acid full-ester groups, polyacid sidechain groups, and mixtures thereof.
9. The process according to claim 6 wherein the weight ratio of said polymer particles that are attached to said inorganic particle to said polymer layer is in the range of from 10:1 to 1:10.

10. The process according to claim 6 wherein said organic-inorganic composite particle has a combined polymer weight of said polymer particles and said polymer layer in the range of from 5 to 90 weight %, based on the weight of said organic-inorganic composite particle.

10/762,047
July 24, 2006

A01484

EVIDENCE APPENDIX


None.

10/762,047
July 24, 2006

A01484

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.

Form PO-140 Form approved by U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Comptroller General, US PATENT OFFICE November 2, 1950 DEPOSIT ACCOUNT ORDER FORM		BEFORE USING THIS ORDER FORM read the important information on the reverse side	
		FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	
MAIL TO: Commissioner for Patents, DATE: 07/24/06 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450		ITEM OR SERVICE	VALUE FURNISHED ACTION OFF. USE
Account No. 18-1850	Order No.		
Name and Address of Depositor: ROHM AND HAAS COMPANY 100 INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST PHILADELPHIA, PA 19106-2399			
DESCRIPTION OF ARTICLES OR SERVICES TO BE FURNISHED			
DOCKET NUMBER: A01484			
In Re Application: Koller et al			
Serial No.: 10/762,047			
Filing Date: January 21, 2004			
FOR: ORGANIC-INORGANIC COMPOSITE PARTICLE AND PROCESS FOR PREPARATION THEREOF			
Fee for: Filing of the Appeal Brief			
Total = \$500.00			
If additional space is needed attach separate sheet. <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 20px;">  Kim R. Jessum, Reg. No. 43,694 </div>			
THIS FORM MAY BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT THE PERMISSION OF THE PATENT OFFICE			

FOR PROMPT, ACCURATE SHIPMENT, PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING MAILING LABEL-PLEASE PRINT OR TYPEWRITE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 PATENT OFFICE
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
 OFFICIAL BUSINESS
 RETURN AFTER FIVE DAYS

ROHM AND HAAS COMPANY
 ATTENTION: PATENT DEPARTMENT
 100 INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST
 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19106-2399